## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

MARKOS N. PAPPAS,	)		
Plaintiff,	)		
vs.	) Case	e No. CIV-12-0753	3-F
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)		
Defendant.	)		

## **ORDER**

Plaintiff, Markos N. Pappas, has filed an objection to the Report and Recommendation of the magistrate judge. Report at doc. no. 9, objection at doc. no. 10. The court has reviewed all objected to matters *de novo*.

Mr. Pappas does not object to the Report's recommendation that his motion for *in forma pauperis* status be denied. Upon review, that aspect of the Report is affirmed. Accordingly, the Report, doc. no. 9, is **AFFIRMED IN PART**, and the motion for *in forma pauperis* status, doc. no. 2, is **DENIED**.

Mr. Pappas does object to dismissal of this action at this time, for failure to pay the filing fee. He states that neither he nor prison officials have received a court order requiring prison officials to make the required payments out of his prison accounts. Plaintiff states that absent such an order, he cannot cause prison officials to remit the funds to the court.

To the extent the Report recommends dismissal of this action absent payment of the initial partial filing fee by August 15, 2012, the report is hereby **MODIFIED**. The due date for payment of the initial partial filing fee is **EXTENDED** until thirty days from the date of this order.

Plaintiff's objection is **GRANTED IN PART**. Doc. no. 10. The objection is **GRANTED** to the extent that plaintiff requests a court order to present to prison officials to secure the payments from his account. To expedite remission of the filing fee, plaintiff may give a copy of this order, along with copies of the magistrate judge's orders at doc. nos. 7 and 9, to the responsible official(s). The Deputy Clerk is **DIRECTED** to mail, along with plaintiff's personal copy of this order, two extra copies of this order and of the orders at doc. nos. 7 and 9, so that plaintiff may conveniently provide a copy of these orders to the individuals at his institution who are responsible for prompt remission of the monthly payments.

Plaintiff is cautioned that absent timely payment of the fee, or absent another extension of time for good cause shown, this action will be dismissed without prejudice consistent with the Report and Recommendation of the magistrate judge.

Dated this 19th day of September, 2012.

STEPHEN P. FRIOT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

12-0753p001.wpd